

**WEB 2.0 SOFTWARE TOOLS:
PRACTICAL APPLICATION FOR SME / SMI**

BY

JANICE TAN SIAW FONG

**Project Paper Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree
of Master of Information Technology**

**Open University Malaysia
(2007)**

Digital Library OUM



0027848

ABSTRACT

Web 2.0 is a term often applied to a perceived ongoing transition of the World Wide Web from a collection of websites that just published information to a full-fledged computing platform serving web applications to end users or the enterprise. Eventually Web 2.0 services are expected to replace desktop computing applications for many purposes.

Interactivity is clearly a dominant Web 2.0 theme. The second main area of Web 2.0 applications is "social networking". A third main area is "tagging", and finally "web service". Web 2.0 applications are very popular now as can be seen in the Internet. For example, technologies such as Blogs, Wikis, Ajax, Mashups, and websites such as flickr.com, Google map, zimbra.com, tadalist.com, del.icio.us, Yahoo 360, and many others.

Many proponents of Web 2.0 believed that Web 2.0 applications would adapt to the Enterprise soon. Many web companies around the world are putting effort in making it happen by developing various web applications that could actually help for the Enterprise.

In this paper we introduce some of the well-developed next generation Web 2.0 applications to be used in the Enterprise, especially SME or SMI. We introduce, compare and study these next generation tools to see if they are practically applicable and bring beneficial for the Enterprise.

Table of Contents

	Page
Title Page	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledge	iii
Declaration	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Figures/ illustrations	viii

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of Study	1
1.2 Objectives of Study	3
1.2.1 Freeform	3
1.2.2 Zero Training / Simple	3
1.2.3 Software as a Service	3
1.2.4 Easily Changed	4
1.2.5 Unintended Uses	4
1.2.6 Social	5
1.3 Technology Overview	5
1.4 Limitation of the Study	7
1.4.1 Challenges	7
1.4.2 Business Values	7

CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 Characteristics of Web 2.0 Applications	10
2.1.1 The Web as a platform	10
2.1.2 Data as the driving force	11
2.1.3 Network effects created by architecture of participation	11
2.1.4 Innovation in Assembly the systems	11
2.1.5 Lightweight business models	12
2.1.6 Social Network	12
2.2 Web 2.0 Adapted to the Enterprise	13
2.2.1 Explore collaboration	13
2.2.2 Consider AJAX	13
2.2.3 Brainstorm	14

2.2.4	Develop an alternative to E-mail	14
2.2.5	Try RSS or ATOM feeds	14
2.2.6	Create production systems	15
2.3	Web 2.0 versus Web 1.0	16
2.4	Contenders of Web 2.0 Activities	19
2.5	Enterprise Web 2.0 Spectrums	20
 CHAPTER 3		
3.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	23
3.1	Example of Web 2.0 Software Tools	23
3.2	Thinkfree Office	24
3.3	Basecamp	25
3.4	Google Docs & Spreadsheets	27
3.5	Google Calendar	29
3.6	Social Text	29
 CHAPTER 4		
4.	DATA ANALYSIS & RESULTS	31
4.1	Text Editor	31
4.1.1	Discussion on Text Editors	35
4.1.2	Screenshot of Writely	36
4.1.3	Screenshot of gOFFICE	37
4.1.4	Screenshot of ThinkFree	37
4.1.5	Comparison between Writely & Microsoft Office for SME – Hassle Rate	38
4.1.6	Comparison between Google Spreadsheets & Microsoft Excel for SME – Hassle Rate	42
4.2	Project Management Application	45
4.2.1	Screenshot of Basecamp	50
4.2.2	Screenshot of Central Desktop	51
4.3	Chat Application	52
4.3.1	How Campfire benefit SME/SMI	55
4.3.2	Screenshot of campfire	56

4.4 Content & Document Management	57
4.4.1 Rate of beneficial of Koral to SME	58
4.4.2 Advantageous of Salesforce ContentExchange to SME	59
4.4.3 Screenshot of Koral / Salesforce ContentExchange	60
4.5 Calendar Application	61
4.5.1 Advantageous of Kiko to SME	61
4.5.2 Screenshot of Kiko	61
CHAPTER 5	
5. DISCUSSION	62
5.1 Cons of Web 2.0 to SME	62
5.2 Technological Barriers	64
5.3 Cultural Barriers	64
CHAPTER 6	
6. SUMMARY & CONCLUSION	66
List of References	68
Appendices	71
Appendix VI Application To Conduct Research Project	71
Appendix VII Research Proposal Approval Form	72
Appendix VIII Project Paper/ Case Study Submission Form	73

List of Figures/ illustrations

Figure 2.1 **Characteristics of Web 2.0**

Figure 2.2 **The Move towards Web 2.0**

http://www.rashmisinha.com/archives/05_08/web2-data-metadata-interface.html

Figure 2.3 **Contenders of Web 2.0 Activities**

Source: Pew Internet & American Life Project Surveys. Margin of error ranges from $\pm 2\%$ to 4% for each sample.

Figure 2.4 **Enterprise Web 2.0 Spectrums**

Figure 4.1 **Web 2.0 Text Editor Comparison for Writely, gOFFICE and ThinkFree**

Figure 4.2 **Comparison of Hassle Rate between Writely & Ms Word**

Figure 4.3 **Comparison of Hassle Rate between Google Spreadsheets & Ms Excel**

Figure 4.4 **Web 2.0 Project Management Application Comparison for Basecamp and Central Desktop**

Figure 4.5 **Campfire Beneficial to SME**

Figure 4.6 **Rate of Beneficial of Koral to SME**

Figure 4.7 **Advantage of Salesforce ContentExchange to SME**

Figure 4.8 **Advantage of Kiko to SME**

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

Web 2.0, a phrase coined by O'Reilly Media in 2004, refers to a supposed second generation of Internet-based services – such as social networking sites, wikis, communications tools, and folksonomies – that emphasize online collaboration and sharing among users. O'Reilly Media, in collaboration with MediaLive International, used the phrase as a title for a series of conference and since 2004 it has become a popular buzzword among technical marketing communities. (Wikipedia)

As defined by O'Reilly, Web 2.0 is the network as platform, spanning all connected devices; and also “architecture of participation”, a constellation made up of links between web applications that rival desktop applications, the blog publishing revolution and self-service advertising. Web 2.0 applications are those that make the most of the intrinsic advantages of that platform: delivering software as a continually-updated service that gets better the more people use it, consuming and remixing data from multiple sources, including individual users, while providing their own data and services in a form that allows remixing by others, creating network effects through an “architecture of participation,” and going beyond the